

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on October 16, 2009. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 17, 18, 21, 25-27, 29, 30, 36 and 44-56 are rejected. In this Amendment, claims 18 and 44 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 17, 18, 21, 25-27, 29, 30, 36 and 44-56 are presented for examination.

### **Summary of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 4-5, 17-18, 21, 25-26, 45-52 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovic et al, (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0107581 A1, hereinafter “Obradovic”) in view of Bailey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,820,076, hereinafter “Bailey”).

Claim 1 recites in part:

A method of storing information in a database to characterize attributes outputted by different classes of equipment, comprising:

storing in a first database table of a database memory device a plurality of attribute data records, wherein storing each attribute data record includes: storing in that record a first field identifying a class of equipment to which remaining fields in the record pertain;

storing in that record a second field identifying an attribute whose value is outputted by the class of equipment identified by the first field of that record, wherein said attribute is a sensor measurement or operating parameter of said class of equipment identified by said first field;

**storing in that record a third field specifying an ID which the class of equipment identified by the first field of that record assigns to the attribute identified by the second field of that record;**

**storing in that record a fourth field specifying conversion parameters that define a conversion of the value of the attribute identified in the second field into physical units of measurement...**

(emphasis added)

Obradovic teaches a database for use with a product stress testing system having a large number of different modules being subjected to a variety of stressors (see, for example, Obradovic, Abstract). The database in Obradovic contains a product table, a result table, a process table, and an equipment command and communication table (see, for example, Obradovic, Fig. 11). The equipment command communication table further contains an equipment table, a command table, and a parsing table. The Office Action interprets the “field for equipment brand ID” to read on the claimed “third field specifying an ID which the class of equipment identified by the first field of that record assigns to the attribute identified by the second field of that record.” (Office Action mailed 10/16/2009 pages 4 and 5).

Applicant disagrees with this interpretation. The equipment brand ID in Obradovic is “used as a key” to identify the brand of equipment being tested (see Obradovic paragraph [0144]). The equipment brand ID is not used by a particular class of equipment to identify an attribute whose value is outputted by that class of equipment. Therefore, Obradovic does not teach or suggest “storing in that record a third field specifying an ID which the class of equipment identified by the first field of that record assigns to the attribute identified by the second field of that record,” as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, the current Office Action states that Obradovic does not teach “storing in that record a fourth field specifying conversion parameters that define a conversion of the value of the attribute identified in the second field into physical units of measurement” as required by claim 1 (Office Action mailed 10/16/2009 pages 4 and 5). However, the current Office Action cites the Bailey reference as teaching this limitation.

Bailey teaches a database system facilitating parametric searching for use in corporate procurement processes. The database in Bailey contains a parts table used to store information regarding items, including a “unit of measure” field used to identify the unit of

measure used to describe an item (see, for example, Bailey Col. 13 lines 27-48). The database in Bailey also contains a mechanism for allowing a user to change the unit of measure displayed for a particular item (e.g. from English system to metric and vice versa) by toggling the conversion value for the entry (see, for example, Bailey Col. 24 lines 1 – 20). Bailey is silent on the existence of values of attributes outputted by certain classes of equipment. Much less does Bailey teach or suggest storing in a record an ID used by a particular class of equipment to identify an attribute whose value is outputted by that class of equipment.

Furthermore, the database entries in Bailey are measurements of items in a particular unit of measure, and therefore do not need to be converted into physical units of measure. Bailey simply allows a user to switch from one unit of measure to another. Therefore, Bailey does not teach or suggest storing in a record a field that defines conversion parameters for converting a value of an attribute outputted by a class of equipment into physical units of measure.

Thus, Bailey lacks the same features of the claimed invention that are missing from Obradovic. Similar, although not identical, language is included in claims 17, 21 and 45. Accordingly, the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 17, 21, and 45 and their corresponding dependent claims is patentable over the combination of Obradovic and Bailey. For the above reasons, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claims 1, 4-5, 17-18, 21, 25-26, 45-52 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 8-9, 27 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovic, in view of Bailey as applied to claims 1, 4-5, 17-18, 21, 25-26, 45-52 and 56 above, in view of Robert C. Beauchesne (U.S. Patent No. 5,777,876, hereinafter “Beauchesne”).

Claims 6, 8-9, 27 and 29-30 depend from claims 1 or 21, respectively, and therefore include at least the same limitations as claim 1 and 21. Thus, Obradovic and Bailey, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 6, 8-9, 27 and 29-30 for the same reasons as given above.

Beauchesne does not help Obradovic and Bailey to render the presently claimed invention unpatentable. Beauchesne teaches a database system for integrating a plurality of manufacturing processes. Contrary to the presently claimed invention, Beauchesne does not teach storing in a record a field that defines conversion parameters for converting a value of an attribute outputted by a class of equipment into physical units of measure. Nor does Beauchesne teach storing in a record an ID used by a particular class of equipment to identify an attribute whose value is outputted by that class of equipment. Thus, Beauchesne lacks the same features of the claimed invention that are missing from Obradovic and Bailey. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claims 6, 8-9, 27 and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 15 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovic, in view of Bailey as applied to claims 1, 4-5, 17-18, 21, 25-26, 45-52 and 56 above, in view of Guillermo Rudolfo Chaçon (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,588, hereinafter “Chaçon”).

Claims 15 and 36 depend from claims 1 or 21, respectively, and therefore include at least the same limitations as claim 1 and 21. Thus, Obradovic and Bailey, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 15 and 36 for the same reasons as given above.

Chaçon does not help Obradovic and Bailey to render the presently claimed invention unpatentable. Chaçon teaches an integrated wafer fabrication production characterization and

scheduling system. Contrary to the presently claimed invention, Chaçon does not teach storing in a record a field that defines conversion parameters for converting a value of an attribute outputted by a class of equipment into physical units of measure. Nor does Chaçon teach storing in a record an ID used by a particular class of equipment to identify an attribute whose value is outputted by that class of equipment. Thus, Chaçon lacks the same features of the claimed invention that are missing from Obradovic and Bailey. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claims 15 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovic, in view of McHale et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0043568, hereinafter “McHale”).

Claim 44 recites, in part, “storing in that record a fourth field specifying an ID which the class of equipment identified by the first field of that record assigns to the attribute value identified by the second field of that record, wherein the ID identifies a first one of the plurality of physical communications interfaces.” As described above, Obradovic does not teach or suggest storing an ID used by a particular class of equipment to identify an attribute whose value is outputted by that class of equipment.

McHale teaches a communication server that maintains profile information on twisted pair lines in a profile table. McHale is silent on the existence of values of attributes outputted by certain classes of equipment. Therefore, McHale does not teach or suggest storing an ID used by a particular class of equipment to identify an attribute whose value is outputted by that class of equipment. Thus, McHale lacks the same features of the claimed invention that are missing from Obradovic. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Obradovic, in view of Bailey as applied to claims 1, 4-5, 17-18, 21, 25-26, 45-52 and 56 above, in further in view of McHale.

Claims 53-55 depend from claim 1 and therefore include at least the same limitations as claim 1. Thus, Obradovic and Bailey, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 53-55 for the same reasons as given above.

McHale does not help Obradovic and Bailey to render the presently claimed invention unpatentable. McHale teaches a communication server that maintains profile information on twisted pair lines in a profile table. Contrary to the presently claimed invention, McHale does not teach storing in a record a field that defines conversion parameters for converting a value of an attribute outputted by a class of equipment into physical units of measure. Nor does McHale teach storing in a record an ID used by a particular class of equipment to identify an attribute whose value is outputted by that class of equipment. Thus, McHale lacks the same features of the claimed invention that are missing from Obradovic and Bailey. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claims 53-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

## **Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections and submits that pending claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 17, 18, 21, 25-27, 29, 30, 36 and 44-56 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Benjamin Kimes at (408) 720-8300.

## **Deposit Account Authorization**

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: January 19, 2010

/Benjamin A. Kimes/

Benjamin A. Kimes  
Registration No. 50,870

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(408) 720-8300